

## GOVERNMENTAL COOPERATION IN TRANSPORTATION ACTIVITIES

(Panel Discussion—Part I)

# Obtaining Cooperation of Governmental Agencies for Transportation Development

MART KASK

Montgomery-Greene County

Transportation and Development Planning Program

Dayton, Ohio

## OBTAINING INTERGOVERNMENTAL COOPERATION IS AN ART

On the subject at hand, let me just say that, if I had the formula for obtaining cooperation of governmental agencies for transportation development or on other matters, I would patent it, or bottle it. I regret to say, however, that there is no pat answer. Each individual situation will have to be treated within limitations or confines. Each issue involves a latitude of considerations including: (1) the governmental units concerned, (2) their goals and objectives, (3) the issue itself, and (4) the performance of the broker. All will play a role in the total process. Obtaining intergovernmental cooperation is an art, not an exact science.

## FOUR COMPONENTS OF COOPERATION

There are certain principles and procedures which can be identified and distinguished in the process of obtaining intergovernmental cooperation. The process has four basic components: (1) actors, (2) goals and objectives, (3) issues, and (4) brokers. The following are examples from my own experience to illustrate the process of obtaining cooperation of governmental agencies for transportation development.

### *Actors*

The actors may be governmental agencies or groups of private citizens representing property owners, businessmen, or industries. The governmental agencies can be classed as federal, state, regional, county and municipal or township. In addition to these five basic operating



**WHO GETS THE HIGHWAY DOLLAR**—Discussing the allocation of highway funds and governmental cooperation in transportation activities at the 56th annual Purdue Road School were, from the left, Mart Kask, director of transportation and development planning, Dayton, Ohio; Vernon Harvey, division engineer, U.S. Bureau of Public Roads, Indianapolis; Mayor James R. Williamson, West Lafayette; Keith Klopfenstein, South Bend, St. Joseph County commissioner; Sterling Bolyard, chief of urban planning, Indiana State Highway Commission, and Prof. William L. Grecco, Purdue research engineer, who presided.

agencies, there are the state and federal legislative branches of the governments and they play a key role in the development of transportation facilities. In addition to the operating and legislative agencies, we have the courts and various regulatory commissions.

### *Goals and Objectives*

Transportation goals, perhaps, can be defined in these simple terms. "The ultimate purpose of a transportation system is to serve people—to help them attain the things they want, to help them go where they wish and need to go, and to enable them to ship and receive the goods required to support their society".\*

These goals can vary in emphasis and relate close by any given actor and his perception of the goal. Consequently the actors participate in the transportation system in different manners. They are either: 1) the consumer or user, 2) the provider, or 3) the environment or the community.

The actors, in the consumer or user group, consist of individuals and organized private interest groups. The government is also a consumer but very seldom acts in this capacity.

---

\* *Policies and Plans for Transportation in New York State*, September, 1968.

The user goals are:\*

- 1) Reduce accidents
- 2) Increase mobility
- 3) Insure dependability of transportation
- 4) Reduce user costs
- 5) Reduce user time
- 6) Reduce effort, increase comfort
- 7) Enhance visual features of transportation facilities

The actors in the group providing transportation services, or facilities, are common carriers as well as federal, state, and local governments. The provider goals are:\*

- 1) Reduce construction costs
- 2) Reduce maintenance costs
- 3) Reduce operating costs

Finally, the goals of the environment or community materialize through regional and local governments, private interest groups and the general public.

All of these interact with the transportation system and their goals are generally to:

- 1) Reduce pollution from transportation sources
- 2) Increase accessibility
- 3) Reduce disruption and dislocation
- 4) Encourage desirable physical and economic development

### *Issues*

The third element of governmental cooperation involves the issue at hand. The issues on transportation development usually fall into two major categories. They are either long range transportation planning issues or transportation plan implementation issues. The plan implementation issues usually involve greater interaction between the actors than do the long range transportation issues. The plan implementation issues can further be divided into issues of 1) priority, 2) facility location, and/or 3) funding.

### *Broker—His Role*

The broker's role is to obtain cooperation of governmental agencies for transportation development. It can be an agency or an individual. In a large metropolitan area, the role of the broker can be assured by a regional planning commission, a council of governments, the chamber of commerce, an influential citizen, or perhaps by the newspapers.

The objective of the broker is to arbitrate and to bring into harmony the different actor groups with conflicting goals and objectives on certain issues.

## PROCEDURES FOR COOPERATION

### *Identify and Define Issues and Actors*

At this time I would like to summarize the identifiable structure in the process of obtaining cooperation of governmental agencies for transportation development. First, one should try to identify and clearly define the issue. Is it a long-range planning issue or an issue in implementation involving priorities, location or funding of transportation facilities? Second, one should try to identify the actors. At the governmental level the actors may range from federal to local level. Often the actors come from the private sector in form of the chamber of commerce, downtown association or a well organized neighborhood group. Often the actors ranks may include state or federal legislative bodies, courts or regulatory commissions. Different actors have differing goals and objectives depending whether they are the users, providers, or the people living in the environment effected by transportation facilities.

### *Arbitration by the Broker*

Finally, the element that I believe is most important in achieving cooperation among governmental agencies is the role of the broker. The broker may be a government agency or an individual whose objective is to arbitrate and bring the actors with differing goals and objectives together on an issue. It is the role of this broker to define issues and push for solutions that invariably require the compromise of one or more of the actors' goals.

## EXAMPLES OF COOPERATION PROCESS

Here are some examples of how this process works in achieving the cooperation of governmental agencies for transportation development. The following five examples involve highway and mass transit projects.

### *Montgomery-Greene County Transportation and Development Planning Program*

The Federal Aid Highway Act of 1962 requires that areas over 50,000 population should be engaged in continuing, comprehensive, cooperative transportation planning to continue receiving federal high-

way dollars. In 1967, shortly after having completed and received acceptance to the regional transportation plan, the federal and state highway officials informed the local community in the Dayton metropolitan area that the plan will require to be kept up to date on a continuing cooperative basis. To accomplish this, the area had to form a transportation planning agency and provide twenty-five per cent of the agency's budget. The issue here was continuing transportation planning. The federal government, the Bureau of Public Roads, the State, the Ohio Department of Highways were cast in the acting role of providers of transportation facilities. At the local level the larger cities and the counties also had the goal of provider of transportation facilities. The smaller cities and villages tend to view their role more as a user and as such saw very little benefit of having to contribute funds to provide for the planning and development of regional transportation facilities. The regional planning commission in the area with a goal of comprehensive area-wide plan development felt that the responsibility for transportation planning should be fixed in their agency. The issue was local funding for planning and who should do the actual planning. The state insisted on establishing strong and binding contractual agreements, as they believed that such agreements can only be established with the board of county commissioners.

To achieve government cooperation on all matters, the president of the Montgomery County Commission assumed the role of the broker and finally after a six-month period achieved cooperation on all fronts. The county commissioners agreed to pay the local share of the planning budget in the event the small local communities were unable to raise the cash. An independent regional transportation planning agency was formed as an agent of the county government. Memoranda of understanding and agreements not to duplicate planning efforts with the efforts of the regional planning commission were signed. Today, the Montgomery-Greene County Transportation and Development Planning Program is over two years old. It has a staff of about 25 persons.

The work program includes: 1) the regional transportation plan update, 2) plan programming and implementation, and 3) mass transit planning. In the development of the transportation planning agency, there was an issue, there were the actors with differing goals, and there was the broker. Governmental cooperation was achieved.

#### *Dayton Area and State of Ohio*

It can be generally stated that in the Dayton metropolitan area there exists good local intergovernmental cooperation particularly on

involving conflict with the state. The review of a bit of history will show why this is the case.

The flood disaster in the early 1900's necessitated the local industrial leadership to take decisive action to bring the community and the industrial production back to life. Consequently, Dayton formed the first city managerial form of government in the United States. Ever since then the community is to a large extent run by "technocrats". The political leaders are listening to the advice of the professional-technical people. For this reason, Dayton has never fared well with the political structure at the state level. Dayton has always been the stepchild of the urban areas in Ohio. To illustrate this, as late as last year, the state left out Dayton as one of the major urban areas on the Ohio road map. To hold their own, the metropolitan area governments have banded together to negotiate with the state on state-administered programs. Local intergovernmental cooperation has become a necessity. The issue here is the state's revenue sharing. The actors are the state and the local governments with somewhat conflicting goals. The broker may be government or a private interest group, depending on the specific issue.

In the Dayton metropolitan area, the role of the broker in transportation development is more and more identified with the transportation planning agency. Our agency in the past has been successful in solving some very serious and complex intergovernmental problems. Early in our planning program we were able to get the state and the Bureau of Public Roads, at Washington level, to reverse a major policy decision that would have delayed our planning program for one year. We were also successful in attracting U. S. Department of Transportation Secretary John A. Volpe as the speaker at our second annual meeting. As you can see, we have good relations with the federal government. We have a close working relationship with our national legislators. Our two-county area is represented in Washington by four congressmen. We have a close working relationship with the National League of Cities, and U. S. Conference of Mayors. The City of Dayton, along with Indianapolis and six other cities, was chosen by the National League of Cities, U. S. Conference of Mayors and the Department of Transportation to study and identify the non-technological impediments to mass transit improvements. The final report was recently published in the February issue of the *Nation's Cities*. The City of Dayton has a staffed office in Washington to coordinate our efforts with the federal government. Our agency has worked hard on behalf of the state and federal legislation. On the state level, we have successfully supported the passage of \$500 million

bond issue for highway construction in Ohio. We worked very hard and got the Ohio Senate and House to overhaul the transit authority legislation in Ohio. At the federal level, our Mayor Dave Hall was asked to testify before the Congressional Committee on behalf of the Public Transportation Act of 1969.

Our agency enjoys the support of our community and our membership roster represents over 99 per cent of the population in the two-county area. Our member governments have never failed to contribute their share of the budgetary commitment. Thus, we have a coordinated, cooperative, continuing transportation planning program going in the Dayton metropolitan area. Our role as the "broker" in governmental cooperation involving transportation matters is being accepted more strongly every day.

Our agency supported and promoted the passage of a state-wide bond issue of \$500 million for highway construction. The voters in November of 1968 passed the measure. Immediately, we began to work with our state legislators to shape this enabling legislation into concrete and steel at home. We were successful through cooperation with the Ohio Municipal League, in writing into the legislation a provision to have the regional transportation agencies in metropolitan areas review the priorities of the projects to be funded out of the bond monies. The allocation of the bond monies to our urban area amounted to about \$16 million. Our technical and policy committees worked closely with local area governments and were able to secure agreement on a program to fund 20 major highway projects of regional importance. It was a difficult task and most other urban areas in Ohio allocated the regional appropriation to local governmental subdivision and accepted most any project proposed by the jurisdiction. We have some problems yet to work out with the state on projects requiring matching state and federal funds. In this instance, there was an issue of allocation of state resources. The actors included state administrations, state legislators, the Ohio Municipal League, our local governments, and the technical and policy committees of our transportation planning process. The goals and objectives differed in many instances, but the broker, the transportation planning agency, was able to bring harmony into the process.

#### *Planning Agency Solves a Route Location Problem*

A good example of obtaining cooperation of governmental agencies for transportation planning can be highlighted in the development of highway plans between Interstate Highway 675 and Wright-Patterson Air Force Base. The route passes through parts of Greene County, Wright State University, the City of Fairborn, and Wright-Patterson

Air Force Base. These agencies, plus the Ohio Department of Highways, the Bureau of Public Roads, the Western Regional Planning Commission, and the transportation planning agency, were the actors in this situation. Prior to involvement of the transportation planning agency, the governmental agencies debated for four years in regard to the facility design and location. The state's desire was to minimize the land acquisition cost and construct the facility on the university's land. The university wanted to maximize their land holding and build the freeway in the City of Fairborn. Wright-Patterson Air Force Base and the City of Fairborn insisted upon certain design criteria to insure coordinating with their local circulation plans. This again required taking more land from the university. After many months of work, systems analysis and evaluation of design alternatives, the local governments came to an agreement and are in the process of making formal submission to the state. An informal reaction by the state has been positive. Here again, the issue, the actors, the goals and the broker can be identified in the process of achieving governmental cooperation.

## SUMMARY

To summarize, I would like again to point out that achieving governmental cooperation is not an exact science, it is an art. However, certain procedures and processes can be identified in the attainment of cooperation. First the issue must be identified. Then the actors with their goals and objectives must be isolated. Then it becomes the job of the broker to bring the factions together.

In the Dayton metropolitan area, our transportation planning agency has done a lot in the area of attaining governmental cooperation. Most times we have been successful in our involvement as the broker. There, however, remain many projects to be done. One is the development of an extension of an urban freeway through our model cities target area. Another is the TOPICS program for the entire urbanized area. Recently, we submitted to D.O.T. an application for development of an urban mass transit corridor by utilizing the more or less abandoned Penn-Central rail right-of-way. We are in the process of working with our member governments and the U. S. Census in the development of an urban data system. Our mass transit system in the area is failing. We are working with our community leaders and the transit company in the formation of a regional transit authority. All this requires intergovernmental cooperation.

In the Dayton area, we have done a lot. Much more remains to be done. For my part, I look forward to it.